

REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS:

Claims 1-7, 9-10 and 14-16 were pending, stand rejected and are now under consideration.

By this Amendment, claims 20 and 21 are added.

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 14-16 and 20-21 are now pending.

No new matter is presented in the new claims, and accordingly, entry and approval of same are submitted to be proper and are respectfully requested.

ITEM 2: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 14 AND 15 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Action at pages 2 and 3, item 2, claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,259) in view of Nakanishi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,844,175).

Applicants traverse the rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

Claim 14

Claim 14 is directed to a touch panel and recites "a conductive film damage preventing element made of an elastic material to prevent damage, by an edge of the double-faced tape, to a remaining one of the conductive films." That is, an edge of the double-faced tape is prevented from damaging a remaining one of the conductive films by a conductive film damage preventing element, the conductive film damage preventing element being different from the double-faced tape.

Maeda et al. Reference

In the Office Action at page 2, lines 15-19, the Examiner asserts that Maeda et al. teaches "a conductive film damage preventing element (reactive adhesive) made of elastic material to prevent damage by the edge of the adhesive tape (10) (see figures 1-2, 5; column 3, lines 54-68; column 4, lines 1-8 and column 7, lines 1-53)."

However, in the Maeda et al. touch-panel input device, “upper transparent plate 2 and lower transparent substrate 3 are fixed to each other by a reactive adhesive [(i.e. which hardens to forms the adhesive layer 10)] disposed around a conductor layer such that the reactive adhesive exhibits elasticity and tacking properties.” (See Maeda et al. at column 7, lines 1-5 and column 7, lines 24-25 regarding the reactive adhesive being the same as the adhesive layer 10 prior to hardening). Thus, since the reactive adhesive is the adhesive layer 10 prior to hardening, the reactive adhesive cannot both correspond to the double-faced tape of the present invention as recited in claim 1 and also prevent damage by an edge thereof.

Furthermore, a contention by the Examiner that the adhesive layer 10 corresponds to the double-faced tape of the present invention as recited in claim 1 is incorrect, since the adhesive layer 10, which is formed entirely from reactive adhesive, is different from “double-faced tape” (emphasis added). Accordingly, Maeda et al. does not disclose or suggest double-faced tape, and, moreover, therefore, cannot disclose or suggest the “conductive film damage preventing element” to prevent damage by an edge of the double-faced tape, since Maeda et al. is silent regarding anything related to the double-faced tape.

Nakanishi et al. Reference

In the Office Action at page 4, lines 19-21, the Examiner asserts that Nakanishi et al. teaches a double-faced tape (10) (see figures 1A, 1B, 4F, 7; column 1, lines 55-52; column 5, lines 1-3 and column 6, lines 17-19).

However, the disclosure of Nakanishi et al. is silent with regard to a structure corresponding to the “conductive film damage preventing element” of the present invention recited in claim 14 and, furthermore, Nakanishi et al. is silent with regard to “prevent[ing] damage, by an edge of the double-faced tape, to a remaining one of the conductive films ...,” (as recited in claim 14). This is because in FIGS 1A-1B, 2-3, 4A-4H, 5A-5G and 6-7 of Nakanishi et al., the adhesive layer 10 (i.e., corresponding to the double-faced tape of the present invention recited in claim 14) is in direct contact with the transparent conductive film 3a (i.e., corresponding to the remaining one of the conductive films of the present invention recited in claim 14). Thus, a structure, which is made of an elastic material, to prevent damage to the remaining one of the conductive films by an edge of the double-faced tape is not shown by any of FIGS. 1A-1B, 2-3, 4A-4H, 5A-5G and 6-7. Furthermore, in FIG. 8 of Nakanishi et al., an

insulative resist layer 9 is formed between the adhesive layer 10 and the transparent conductive film 3a, but Nakanishi et al. is silent regarding the insulative resist layer 9 being an elastic material and, moreover, the function of the insulative resist layer 9 is merely to cover the take-out electrodes 4. (See Nakanishi et al. at column 14, line 62 to column 2, line 3.)

Accordingly, claim 14 is submitted to patentably distinguish over the cited art taken singularly or in any proper combination, and is submitted to be allowable.

Claim 15, which depends from claim 14, is submitted to be allowable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as claim 14, as well as for the additional recitations therein.

ITEM 3: REJECTION OF CLAIM 1-4, 9-10 AND 14-16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Action at pages 3-4, item 3, claim 1-4, 9-10 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakanishi et al. in view of Aroyan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,163,313) and Katsumura (JP 04-143823).

Applicants traverse the rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

It is submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Nakanishi et al. for reasons similar to those of claim 14.

Aroyan et al. and Katsumura References

It is submitted that the additional references of Aroyan et al and Katsumura do not overcome the deficiencies of the Nakanishi et al.

Aroyan et al. discloses "the cover sheet 210 is typically joined to the remainder of the touch screen 105 with an adhesive along its associated edges, or optionally, with an insulative adhesive frame 225 or the like. Additionally, an electrode 230 connects the conductive coating 220 of the cover sheet 210 via lead 235 to an appropriate external circuitry, such as the controller circuit 110." (See Aroyan et al. at column 11 lines 35-42 and also FIG. 5 at numerical reference 225 (i.e., the adhesive frame.)) However, it is clear from FIG. 5 of Aroyan et al. that a structure corresponding to the "conductive film damage preventing element" of the prevent invention recited in claim 1 is not shown and, furthermore, the disclosure of Aroyan et al. is silent with regard to "prevent[ing] damage, by an edge of the double-faced tape, to a remaining one of the conductive films ...," (as recited in claim 1).

In the Office Action at page 4, lines 19-21, the Examiner asserts that Katsumura teaches "a conductive film damage preventing element (4) made of elastic material (rubber) (see figure 1; abstract and constitution).

However, the Katsumura touch panel prevents conductive film damage by gap holding members 4 (i.e., spacers) and, in particular, not by double-faced tape. Katsumura is silent regarding "double-faced tape" and, furthermore, the prevention of damage from the double-faced tape by the conductive film damage preventing element.

Accordingly, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art taken singularly or in any proper combination and is submitted to be allowable thereover.

Claim 2-4, 9-10 and 14-16

Claim 14 for reasons similar to those of claim 1, is also submitted to be allowable over the cited art.

Claims 2-4, 9-10 and 15-16, which depend from claims 1 and 14, are submitted to be allowable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 14, as well as for the additional recitations therein.

ITEM 4: REJECTION OF CLAIM 5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Action at page 5, item 4, claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakanishi et al. in view of Aroyan et al., Katsumura and Hino et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,168,910).

Applicants traverse the rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

Claim 5, which depends from claim 1, is submitted to be allowable over Nakanishi et al. in view of Aroyan et al. and Katsumura for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Hino et al. Reference

It is submitted that the additional reference of Hino et al. does not overcome the deficiencies of the Nakanishi et al. in view of Aroyan et al. and Katsumura, because Hino et al. does not disclose or suggest the "conductive film damage preventing element" (as recited in

claim 1). This is because, Hino et al., which is directed to a method for removing a decomposition residue of a material of a resin layer inside of holes formed in the resin layer of a printed board (see, for example, Hino et al. at column 3, lines 59-63), is relied on by the Examiner to teach the diameter of a laser spot, and, in particular, does not disclose or suggest anything related to double-faced tape or a structure of a touch panel.

Accordingly, claim 5, which depends from claim 1, is submitted to be allowable over Nakanishi et al. in view of Aroyan et al., Katsumura and Hino et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the additional recitations therein.

ITEM 5: REJECTION OF CLAIM 6 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Action at page 5, item 5, claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakanishi et al. in view of Aroyan et al., Katsumura and Sukenori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,943,106).

Applicants traverse the rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

Claim 6, which depends from claim 1, is submitted to be allowable over Nakanishi et al. in view of Aroyan et al. and Katsumura for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Sukenori et al. Reference

It is submitted that the additional reference of Sukenori et al. does not overcome the deficiencies of the Nakanishi et al. in view of Aroyan et al. and Katsumura because Sukenori et al. does not disclose or even suggest the “conductive film damage preventing element” (as recited in claim 1). This is because, Sukenori et al., which is directed to a liquid crystal display device and a manufacturing method thereof (see, for example, Sukenori et al. at column 2, lines 54-57), is relied on by the Examiner to teach the wavelength of a laser light for etching being more than 900nm, and, in particular, does not disclose or suggest anything related to double-faced tape or a structure of a touch panel.

Accordingly, claim 6 is submitted to be allowable over Nakanishi et al. in view of Aroyan et al., Katsumura and Sukenori et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the additional recitations therein.

ITEM 6: REJECTION OF CLAIM 7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Action at page 6, item 6, claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakanishi et al. in view of Aroyan et al., Katsumura and Yamagishi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5844,175).

Applicants traverse the rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

Claim 7, which depends from claim 1, is submitted to be allowable over Nakanishi et al. in view of Aroyan et al. and Katsumura for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Yamagishi et al. Reference

It is submitted that the additional reference of Yamagishi et al. does not overcome the deficiencies of Nakanishi et al. in view of Aroyan et al. and Katsumura because Yamagishi et al. does not disclose or even suggest the “conductive film damage preventing element” (as recited in claim 1). This is because, Yamagishi et al., which is directed to insulating material for a thin film multi-layered wiring substrate (see, for example, Yamagishi et al. at column 3, lines 53-55), is relied on by the Examiner to teach the pulse width of a laser light for etching being 1 ns, and, in particular, does not disclose or suggest anything related to double-faced tape or the structure of a touch panel.

Accordingly, claim 7 is submitted to be allowable over Nakanishi et al. in view of Aroyan et al., Katsumura and Yamagishi et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the additional recitations therein.

NEW CLAIMS 20 AND 21

New claims 20 and 21 are provided to afford a varying scope of protection.

New claim 20 recites a film shielding unit provide adjacent an edge of the double-faced tape to prevent damage thereby to one of the conductive films of the pair of panels which receives input pressure,” and is submitted to be allowable.

New claim 21 recites “a shielding unit provide adjacent an edge of the double-faced tape to prevent damage thereby to one of the conductive films of the pair of panels,” and is submitted to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 5/3/04

By: 
Eric Berkowitz
Registration No. 44,030

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501